

REMARKS

The Office Action dated May 9, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 3-14, 16-21, and 24-26 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1, 14, 20-21, and 26 are independent claims. Claims 1, 4-7, 9-14, and 21 have been amended and claim 26 has been added to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. No new matter has been added and new issues have been presented that require further consideration and/or search. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested because entry places the claims in condition for allowance or alternatively in better condition for appeal. Claims 1, 3-14, 16-21, and 24-26 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-12, 14, 17-18, and 20-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 02/13567 of Kauppinen et al. ("Kauppinen") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,539,217 of Syed et al. ("Syed"). As to claims 2 and 22-23, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 22-23 have previously been cancelled and this cancellation was recognized by the USPTO at item 2 of the Office Action, and that therefore the rejection is moot as to those claims. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as to claims 1, 3-4, 7, 9-12, 14, 17-18, and 20-21.

Claim 1, upon which claims 3-13 depend, is directed to a method including providing a user equipment with an access to a service through an access entity of a first

network to a gateway of a second network, the service provided in the second network, the user equipment being in a different time zone than the gateway of the second network. The method also includes generating subscriber information comprising a time zone indication of the user equipment in the access entity of the first network. The method further includes transmitting the subscriber information from the access entity of the first network to the gateway of the second network. The method additionally includes generating charging information for charging for the service based on the time zone indication.

Claim 14, upon which claims 16-19 depend, is directed to a communication system. The system includes a first network comprising an access entity configured to provide network access for a user equipment. The system also includes a second network comprising a gateway and configured to provide a service for the user equipment via the access entity and the gateway. The system further includes charging information generating means configured to generate the charging information for charging for the service based on the time zone indication. The access entity of the first network comprises subscriber information generating means configured to generate the subscriber information comprising a time zone indication and subscriber information transmitting means configured to transmit the subscriber information from the access entity to the gateway of the second network. The gateway is configured to receive the time zone indication.

Claim 20 is directed to an access entity in a first network. The access entity is configured to generate subscriber information comprising a time zone indication relating to a location of a user equipment in connection with the access entity and transmit the subscriber information from the access entity to a gateway of a second network. The second network is configured to provide a service for the user equipment via the access entity and the gateway, and the gateway is in a different time zone than the user equipment.

Claim 21, upon which claims 24-25 depend, is directed to a gateway configured to provide charging information using information regarding a time zone indication of a user equipment. The gateway is in a second network and the user equipment is provided with the network access by an access entity of a first network. The second network is configured to provide a service for the user equipment via the access entity and the gateway, and the gateway is in a different time zone than the user equipment.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of cited references, Kauppinen and Syed, fails to disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1, 14, 20, and 21 and the dependent claims that depend from them.

Kauppinen generally relates to a method for handling the processing of a connection such as a call when a subscriber is attached to a visited network, as explained at page 2, lines 4-7 of Kauppinen. As described at page 3, lines 8-19, of Kauppinen, service information and/or other information is transferred from a visited network to a home network. A proxy CSCF in the visited network may pass the information to a

serving CSCF in the home network, or to a home subscriber's server. One objective of Kauppinen is to allow an appropriate charging or other call control where a roaming subscriber calls to a destination in the visited network, as explained at page 3, lines 21-27. Because the home network does not normally know detailed information on local numbers used in the visited network, in the proxy CSCF the visited network is adapted to add information about the called local destination, which may indicate the charging rate and type of destination. According to Kauppinen, and as shown in particular in figures 2 and 3 of that document, the service is provided in the visited network, see also page 3, lines 23-27, page 6, lines 7-9, and page 8, lines 26-28.

As described at page 6, lines 23-27 and page 8, lines 18-21 of Kauppinen, the proxy means 3 shown in figures 1-3 of Kauppinen or the local service element 8 shown in figures 2 and 3 may store information that includes the time zone of the visited network. When receiving a message from a mobile network element 1 requesting to be connected to a network element registered to the visited network, the proxy means 3 looks up additional information or parameters and sends a message to the serving CSCF of the home network. The message sent to the home network serving CSCF may relate to visited network or network elements as well information on parameters stored for the called party.

Although Kauppinen appears to describe that the time zone information concerning the first network is available to network elements of the first network, Kauppinen does not say what is done with this information or why it is needed. In

particular, Kauppinen does not say that a time zone indication of the user equipment is generated, and does not specifically describe that the user equipment's time zone indication is sent to the gateway of the second network, whereas the claims, for example claim 1, recite “generating the charging for charging the service based on the time zone indication.” (Emphasis added.) Kauppinen also does not disclose that the second network is located in a different time zone than the first network, that the service is provided in the second network, and that the charging information is generated based on the time zone indication. The significance of the time zone of the visited network is not at all clear from Kauppinen, because the service is provided in the same network as that in which the user is located. The presence and significance of any time zone differences are simply not discussed in Kauppinen.

In contrast, claim 1 recites “the user equipment being in a different time zone than the gateway of the second network” and “generating the charging information for charging for the service based on the time zone indication,” claim 14 recites “the charging information generating means is configured to generate the charging information based on the time zone indication,” claim 20 recites “wherein the second network is configured to provide a service for the user equipment via the access entity and the gateway, and the gateway is in a different time zone than the user equipment,” and claim 21 recites “wherein the second network is configured to provide a service for the user equipment via the access entity and the gateway, and the gateway is in a different

time zone than the user equipment.” It is respectfully submitted that Kauppinen fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-identified features of the invention.

Thus, as defined in claims 1, 20, and 21 the user equipment is located in a different time zone than the gateway of the second network, in which the service is provided. In Kauppinen in contrast, the service is provided in the same network in which the user equipment is located (i.e. in the visited network).

The Office Action acknowledged these deficiencies of Kauppinen and supplied Syed to remedy these deficiencies.

Syed generally relates to method and arrangement for use in mobile communication networks spanning multiple time zones. Syed, in figure 1, shows three regions 14A, 14B, and 14C that may be three different time zones and may be served by a single satellite 16. A mobile station 26A or 26C may be located in a different time zone from base station 18. However, base station 18 and mobile stations 26A and 26C are all in the same satellite network provided by satellite 16, via spot beams 28A and 28C and the satellite link through which base station 18 connects to the satellite using a dish antenna as shown in Figure 1.

Accordingly, Syed, even when viewed in combination with Kauppinen, fails to disclose or suggest the recitations with regard to which Kauppinen is deficient. Specifically, claim 1 recites “the user equipment being in a different time zone than the gateway of the second network” and “generating the charging information for charging for the service based on the time zone indication,” claim 14 recites “the charging

information generating means is configured to generate the charging information based on the time zone indication,” claim 20 recites “wherein the second network is configured to provide a service for the user equipment via the access entity and the gateway, and the gateway is in a different time zone than the user equipment,” and claim 21 recites “wherein the second network is configured to provide a service for the user equipment via the access entity and the gateway, and the gateway is in a different time zone than the user equipment.” It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kauppinen and Syed fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-identified features of the invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1, 14, 20 and 21 be withdrawn.

Claims 3-4, 7, 9-12, and 17-18 depend from claims 1 and 14 respectively, and recite additional limitations. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 3-4, 7, 9-12, and 17-18 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the combination of Kauppinen and Syed, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 3-4, 7, 9-12, and 17-18 be withdrawn.

Claims 5-6 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kauppinen in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0091632 of Turock et al. (“Turock”). The Office Action took the position that Kauppinen teaches all of the elements of the claims except “with a prepaid account and managing the prepaid account in connection with the gateway,” “wherein the verifying step comprises verifying if the prepaid account possesses enough prepaid resources for receiving the service,” “charging

information generating means configured to generate the charging information for charging for the service based on the time zone information,” and “wherein a subscriber of the user equipment possesses a prepaid account to be used in charging the service.” The Office Action supplied Turock to remedy the deficiencies of Kauppinen. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 5-6 and 19 depend from claims 1 and 14 respectively and recite additional limitations. The rejection of claims 1 and 14 admitted that Kauppinen fails to disclose or suggest all the features of those claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that similarly fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claims 5-6 and 19. Moreover, even if Kauppinen were supplemented with Syed and Turock, the combination would not disclose or suggest all of the features of claims 1 and 14, because Turock fails to remedy the above-described deficiencies of Kauppinen.

Turock generally relates to a method and system for linking prepaid cards and calls using those cards to pay for content and other services over the internet. As Turock explained at paragraph [0005], Turock provides a system and method of managing a prepaid card account to provide offers for goods and/or services in real time. In particular, when a user establishes an electronic communication with a services provider and the service provider receives the user’s prepaid card account card account number, the prepaid card account manager is notified. The prepaid account manager selects and transmits an offer of goods and/or services based on an internet database that corresponds to the user’s prepaid card account.

Turock, however, is silent as to the recitations with regard to which the combination of Kauppinen and Syed is deficient. Specifically, claim 1 recites “the user equipment being in a different time zone than the gateway of the second network” and “generating the charging information for charging for the service based on the time zone indication” and claim 14 recites “the charging information generating means is configured to generate the charging information based on the time zone indication.” It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kauppinen, Syed (if had been included in the rejection), and Turock fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-identified features of the invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 5-6 and 19 be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Kauppinen in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046090 of Stewart (“Stewart”). The Office Action took the position that Kauppinen teaches all the elements of the claim except “generating said information regarding the time zone by mapping a Greenwich Mean Time time zone to a location of the user equipment.” The Office Action cited Stewart to remedy the deficiencies of Kauppinen. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 depends from claim 1 and recites additional limitations. The Office Action admitted that Kauppinen does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, but did not, in this rejection, provide a reference that remedies those deficiencies.

Stewart is directed to a distributed network system that transmits information to users based on past transactions of the users. Stewart generally describes a geographic-based communications service system that has a mobile unit for transmitting/receiving information. Stewart at paragraph 0045 describes a capability of adjusting the clocks of a mobile terminal to adjust to the time zone of the access point that is being used. Stewart, however, is silent about providing the mobile terminal's time zone information to the gateway or regarding any of the above-identified deficiencies of Kauppinen with or without Syed.

The combination of Kauppinen, Syed (if it had been included in the rejection), and Stewart does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention, because Stewart does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Kauppinen and Syed. Therefore it is respectfully requested that rejection of claim 8 be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Kauppinen in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,097,945 of Evensen et al. ("Evensen"). The Office Action took the position that Kauppinen teaches all the elements of the claims except "pricing the service according to a function of a time of the day when the service is provided" and "verifying means configured to verify whether the service is providable based on said information regarding the time zone." The Office Action supplied Evensen to remedy the deficiencies of Kauppinen. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13 and 16 depend from claims 1 and 14 respectively, and recite additional limitations. The Office Action admitted that

Kauppinen does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1 and 14, but did not, in this rejection, provide a reference that remedies those deficiencies.

Evensen is directed to handling of time zones in a telecommunication system. As explained by Evensen, a personal time table can be used to route calls. However, when a person travels to a new time zone, the time table must be changed if the same time of day is required for the time table, or in other words, the time table must be specified in "local time." Accordingly, Evensen proposes that a caller may call to personal number of a call recipient. The hardware where the call is received may access the time table of the recipient and adjust the time table based on the time zone provided by the subscriber TZB, as explained at col. 2, line 38 to col. 3, line 64. Accordingly, Evensen does not address the above-identified deficiencies of Kauppinen.

The combination of Kauppinen, Syed (if it had been included in the rejection), and Evensen does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention, because Evensen does not remedy the above-described deficiencies of Kauppinen and Syed. Therefore it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 13 and 16 be withdrawn.

Conclusion


For the reasons explained above, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1, 3-14, 16-21, and 24-25 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the

cited art. Therefore it is respectfully requested that all of claims 1, 3-14, 16-21, and 24-25 be allowed, and that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Flanagan
Registration No. 58,178

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

PCF:kmp